

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

United States of America,

Plaintiff,

v.

Emmanuel Gonzalez-Sanchez  
Defendant(s).

Case No. CR 18-278 WHA

STIPULATED ORDER EXCLUDING TIME  
UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT

**FILED**

JUL 18 2018

For the reasons stated by the parties on the record on 7/18/18, the Court excludes 7/18/18 to 8/14/18 and finds that the ends of justice in a speedy trial outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A). The Court makes this finding and bases this continuance on the following factor(s):

- \_\_\_\_\_ Failure to grant a continuance would be likely to result in a miscarriage of justice. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i).
- \_\_\_\_\_ The case is so unusual or so complex, due to *[check applicable reasons]* \_\_\_\_\_ the number of defendants, \_\_\_\_\_ the nature of the prosecution, or \_\_\_\_\_ the existence of novel questions of fact or law, that it is unreasonable to expect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial itself within the time limits established by this section. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).
- \_\_\_\_\_ Failure to grant a continuance would deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).
- \_\_\_\_\_ Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given counsel's other scheduled case commitments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).
- ✓ Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: 7/18/18

STIPULATED:

Attorney for Defendant

LAUREL BEELER  
United States Magistrate Judge

Assistant United States Attorney